

Evaluation of the robustness of optical density as a tool for estimation of biomass in microalgal culture

the effects of growth conditions and physiological state

Nielsen, Søren Laurentius; Hansen, Benni Winding

Published in:
Aquaculture Research

DOI:
[10.1111/are.14227](https://doi.org/10.1111/are.14227)

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (APA):

Nielsen, S. L., & Hansen, B. W. (2019). Evaluation of the robustness of optical density as a tool for estimation of biomass in microalgal culture: the effects of growth conditions and physiological state. *Aquaculture Research*, 50(9), 2698-2706. <https://doi.org/10.1111/are.14227>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Evaluation of the robustness of optical density as a tool for estimation of biomass in microalgal
cultivation – the effects of growth conditions and physiological state

Running title: Use of optical density as biomass-proxy

Søren Laurentius Nielsen*

Orcid ID: 0000-0003-4309-5153

Benni Winding Hansen

Orcid ID: 0000-0003-1145-561X

Department of Science and Environment

Roskilde University

Universitetsvej 1

DK-4000 Roskilde

Denmark

*: Corresponding author, e-mail: nielsen@ruc.dk; phone: +45 4674 2722

Abstract

We evaluate the robustness of optical density (OD) as a tool in the assessment of the biomass of the cryptophyte *Rhodomonas salina* under different growth conditions. We measure the OD under three different wavelengths, 550, 665 and 750 nm.

We find, as expected, that growth rates of the microalga depend strongly on growth conditions, being highest in saturating light conditions under non-limiting nitrogen availability.

OD – cell count relationships are strong and well defined regardless of growth conditions and wavelength used for measurement. However, measuring within the absorption range of chlorophyll, at 550 and 665 nm, does give higher regression coefficients under conditions leading to a high cell chlorophyll content, while the coefficients of determinations are slightly higher when cell chlorophyll content is low.

We conclude that to use OD as a proxy for biomass under large-scale production of microalgae, it is important to take into account that the precise relationship between OD and algal biomass does depend on factors such as irradiance and nutrient availability, and hence the physiological state of the microalgae as well as the production conditions. Errors in estimation of biomass may range from 44 % to 95 %, if these factors are not taken into consideration.

Keywords

Biomass, Large-scale microalgal production, Microalgal aquaculture, Nutrients, Pigments

Introduction

Large-scale production of microalgal biomass is becoming increasingly important for a number of purposes ranging from biofuel production, over feedstock, to production of pharmaceuticals (Guedes et al., 2011; Sasso et al., 2012; Skarka, 2012). Regardless of the purpose, a fast and efficient method for determining the microalgal biomass and growth rate is needed. Measurement of optical density (OD) is probably the best-suited method for use in large-scale production of microalgal biomass (Sarrafzadeh et al., 2015). It can be done in-line, alleviating the need for opening and sampling in the production system, and it provides data in real-time, without the delay caused by taking and analyzing samples manually. In addition, due to the high degree of automation that can be achieved by using OD measurements, it is also the cheapest of the available methods. Alternative methods include extremely time-consuming manual cell counting by microscopy, chlorophyll analysis involving sampling, extraction and measurement, or automated counting on e.g. an electronic particle counter, which is faster, but still necessitates taking samples from the production system.

However, it is necessary to take into consideration that OD is a proxy for biomass, rather than a measurement of biomass itself. OD is not only determined by the biomass present, but is also affected by various characteristics of the biomass, especially the color or other parameters affecting the opaqueness of the microalgal biomass (Griffiths et al., 2011). The relationship between biomass and OD can therefore be expected to vary depending on the physiological state of the microalgae (Griffiths et al., 2011), and hence on production conditions. OD is also sensitive to contamination of the production system. The presence of dead algae, other organisms, other types of particles, and CDOM (colored dissolved organic matter) from microalgal metabolites will contribute to OD (Kirk, 1994). It is therefore

necessary to be able directly to relate OD measurements to the cell concentration or biomass of the microalgae under the actual culture conditions in the production system.

The wavelength at which OD is measured will also affect measurements. In fermentation, using bacteria or fungi, OD is usually measured at 750 nm (Shuler & Kargi, 2005). However, microalgae universally contain the photosynthetic pigment chlorophyll *a* and 750 nm is outside its absorption range. This has several implications. On one hand, using 750 nm means that measurements will be independent of variations in the chlorophyll content of the microalgal biomass. On the other hand, measurements at this wavelength will not be microalgae specific. If instead measurements were done within the absorption range of chlorophyll, measurements would be more sensitive to changes in microalgal biomass and be less affected by other kinds of particles in the production system. However, measurements would be sensitive to changes in the chlorophyll content of the microalgal biomass independent of concomitant changes in biomass. Measuring OD within the absorption range of chlorophyll therefore has both advantages and disadvantages compared to the more common practice of using 750 nm for measurement of OD (Becker, 1994). Several wavelengths within the absorption range of chlorophyll have been suggested for measurement of OD of microalgal cultures, including measuring at wavelengths close to one of the absorption peaks of chlorophyll e.g. around 665 nm, as well as measuring close to the absorption minimum of chlorophyll around 550 nm (Becker, 1994; Griffiths et al., 2011). The former would maximize sensitivity towards microalgal biomass; the latter would minimize effects of changes in chlorophyll content not related to changes in biomass.

Changes in microalgal pigmentation depend on external environmental parameters as well as on the physiological state of the algae. It is well known that microalgae compensate for limiting light availability by increasing their cell specific chlorophyll concentration (e.g.

Antoine & Benson-Evans, 1983). Because chlorophyll, as well as the rest of the photosynthetic machinery of algae, contain nitrogen, the nitrogen availability also affects cell chlorophyll concentration (Seip et al., 1992). In this study, we work with the cryptophyte *Rhodomonas salina* (Wislouch) D.R.A.Hill & R.Wetherbee, which is an important feed alga in the production of live feed for aquaculture (Vu et al., 2016). *Rhodomonas*, in addition to chlorophyll *a* and *c*, also contain the pigment phycoerythrin, giving the algae a reddish color. It can be expected that this additional pigment will add further complexity to the establishment of relationships between OD and microalgal biomass, here determined as cell count, as well as carbon biomass and nitrogen biomass. We examine and establish OD – cell count relationships under two different irradiances as well as under two different nitrogen regimes together with growth rates and cell pigment concentrations, and we establish relationships between carbon biomass and nitrogen biomass and cell count. We expect that the OD of the microalgae will vary not only according to their cell density, but also be affected by both light and nitrogen availability, influencing the pigment content of the cells. Furthermore, we expect that changes in cell count will cause a larger increase in OD when measured at 550 and 665 nm than at 750 nm, but also that measuring at 550 and 665 nm will cause an increase in the ‘noise’ caused by variations in pigment content. We conducted the experiments as short-term batch experiments even though this means that the algal cultures were not in so-called balanced growth. We did this because this type of experiments are relevant to many types of microalgal production, where the algae are rarely in balanced growth.

Materials and Methods

Algal strain and culture conditions

In this study, we used the cryptophyte *Rhodomonas salina*, obtained as SCCAP K-1487 of the Scandinavian Culture Collection of Algae and Protozoa (University of Copenhagen, Denmark). Cultures of *R. salina* were maintained in acid washed 5 L round-bottom glass flasks containing autoclaved 0.2 μm filtered seawater (salinity 30 ‰) enriched with B1 medium (1 mL L⁻¹ of seawater, (Hansen, 1989)). The cultures were maintained under a continuous irradiance of 80 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) in a thermostatted room at 20 °C. The flasks were gently aerated with atmospheric air (400 ppm CO₂) provided through 0.45 μm filters to mix the cultures to avoid temperature stratification, algal sedimentation, CO₂ depletion and O₂ accumulation.

Experimental design

For the experiments, the microalgae were grown in a Multicultivator MC1000 OD (Photon Systems Instruments, Czech Republic) with eight 100 mL test tubes. The test tubes were immersed in a 5 L rectangular glass container in which water was circulated by a pump through a cooling unit to maintain a stable temperature of 20 °C in all test tubes. Each test tube was bubbled individually with atmospheric air. The test tubes were illuminated by cool-white LEDs. These LEDs emit in the range 400 – 665 nm, with a main peak in the blue area (445 nm) and a secondary peak in the range 535 – 570 nm. Two levels of irradiance were used: 140 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (PAR) (saturating light) and 20 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (PAR) (limiting light) (Vu et al., 2016). For the experiments, nutrient medium with two different levels of nitrogen content were used. For all experiments we used the standard B1 medium (Hansen, 1989), except that nitrogen deplete conditions were achieved by using the B1

medium with a nitrogen content of $1/10^{\text{th}}$ of the standard B1 medium. All other nutrients were kept at surplus concentrations as defined by the standard B1 medium. The effects of light and nitrogen availability were tested in a 2x2 factorial design with four replicates ($n = 4$).

Growth rate measurement

The cell density of *R. salina* was determined twice per day with approximately 12 h intervals during the experimental runs. The algae left the exponential growth phase and entered the stationary phase 35 – 200 h after the initialization of the experimental run, depending on the growth conditions. For calculation of growth rates, only data from the exponential growth phase were included. The cell density as well as the cell biovolume were measured on a Beckman Multisizer3 Coulter Counter (Beckman Coulter Inc., USA). All particles with a diameter in the range 5 – 12 μm were considered algal cells.

Cell density – OD relationships

After measurement of cell number and biovolume on the Coulter Counter, the optical density of the same samples was measured without any extraction on a spectrophotometer (GENESYS 6, ThermoFisher, USA) at 550, 665 and 750 nm to achieve corresponding measurements of cell count and optical density in the same samples. It should be noted that the built-in OD measurement facility of the Multicultivator MC-1000 OD was not used in this study, as it does not operate at the wavelengths we wanted to use in measuring OD.

Carbon and nitrogen biomass

After measurement of OD as described above, the algal samples were filtered on to glass fiber filters (Whatman GF/C). The filters were dried at 105 °C to constant weight, after which

the filters with the retained algae were analyzed on a CHN-analyzer, using cystine and acetanilide as standards, to yield the carbon and nitrogen content of the microalgal biomass as well as the C/N-ratio.

Calculation of coefficients for the OD – carbon biomass and OD – nitrogen biomass relationships

From the measurements described above, the relationship between OD and cell count (CC) is established as $OD = a \cdot CC$, the relationship between carbon biomass (CB) and cell count as $CB = b \cdot CC$, and the relationship between nitrogen biomass (NB) and cell count as $NB = c \cdot CC$. From it follows that $CB = \frac{b}{a} OD$ and $NB = \frac{c}{a} OD$.

Algal pigments

Pigment samples were taken at the conclusion of the cultivation period. Chlorophylls *a* and *c* were extracted using standard methods (Jeffrey & Humphrey, 1975; Ritchie, 2006). Filter samples were lyophilized before extraction. Each of these filters was placed in a glass vial where 3.3 mL of 90 % acetone was added. Samples were shaken on a whirly mixer. Then samples were placed in the dark for 24 h at 5 °C. The extraction solvent in each vial was transferred into a quartz cuvette through a 0.2 µm pore size syringe filter and the absorbance was measured at 664 and 630 nm on a spectrophotometer (GENESYS 6, ThermoFisher, USA). The concentration of chlorophyll *a* and *c* was expressed as pg cell⁻¹.

Phycoerythrin (PE) was extracted based on procedures described in the literature (Bennett & Bogorad, 1973; Zimba, 2012), and modified in our own laboratory (Thoisen et al., 2017). After lyophilization, each of the filter samples for PE extraction was placed in a glass vial together with 3 mL phosphate buffer (0.1 mol pH 7, 0.05 mol K₂HPO₄, 0.05 mol

KH₂PO₄). Samples were sonicated in an ice water bath for 15 min and then left refrigerated for 12 h. Extraction solvent was filtered through a 0.2 µm pore size syringe filter into a cuvette for spectrophotometric measurement of the absorbance at 455, 564 and 592 nm. The concentration of PE was calculated according to the literature (Bennett & Bogorad, 1973), and expressed as pg cell⁻¹.

Statistical analyses

Growth rates were calculated by ln-transforming the cell counts, followed by linear regression analysis of the increase in cell count over time (Sokal & Rohlf, 1995). For the two N-replete treatments a simple least-squares linear regression was performed. The two N-deplete treatments showed a two-phased growth response due to the onset of N-limitation, so for these treatments sequential least-squares linear regression was used. Only the slope of the first linear sequence, corresponding to exponential growth, is reported in Table 1. GraphPad Prism 8 was used for the linear regression analyses.

The relationships between cell number and optical density were evaluated using least-squares linear regression analysis (Sokal & Rohlf, 1995), as described above, using GraphPad Prism 8.

Cell count – carbon biomass and cell count – nitrogen biomass relationships were analyzed using linear regression analysis. As with the growth rates, simple least squares linear regression was used for the two N-replete treatments, while sequential least-squares linear regression was used for the two N-deplete treatments, that showed a saturation of the nitrogen biomass at high cell counts due to N-limitation. As for the growth rate analyses, we used GraphPad Prism 8.

The slopes of the resulting regression lines from the above analyses were tested against each other for statistically significant differences based on the procedures described in Sokal and Rohlf (1995), using the TestSlopes procedure of the RealStats package v. 5.4.2 with $\alpha = 0.05$.

Chlorophyll *a* and *c* as well as PE concentrations were subjected to one-way ANOVA with treatment as a fixed factor. Tukey's test was subsequently used to compare individual means across treatments. Data were tested for homogeneity of variance (Cochran's test) and normal distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnoff goodness of fit test) before being analyzed by ANOVA (Quinn & Keough, 2002). All tests were carried out using SYSTAT v. 13 with $\alpha = 0.05$.

Results

Growth rates

Growth rates, as established through direct cell counts, varied between treatments (evaluation of 95 % C.I., Table 1, Fig. 1). The highest growth rate was seen under nitrogen replete conditions under saturating light, where a specific growth rate of 0.82 d^{-1} was obtained. The second highest specific growth rate was obtained under nitrogen deplete, saturating light, conditions and found to be 0.50 d^{-1} . Limiting light conditions yielded the lowest specific growth rates with a growth rate of 0.21 d^{-1} under both nitrogen conditions. It should be noted that for the two nitrogen deplete treatments, only the first part of the sequential regression lines are considered in the comparison of growth rates, as the sequential linear regression analysis shows a decline in growth rate, probably due to nitrogen limitation, after 78 hours under light limitation and after 35 hours under light saturation.

Cell count – OD relationships

The relationships found between direct cell counts and optical density are shown in Figs. 2A (nitrogen replete, limiting light), 2B (nitrogen replete, saturating light), 2C (nitrogen deplete, limiting light) and 2D (nitrogen deplete, saturating light). The linear relationships are all strongly statistically significant, with slopes in the range 2.3 – 3.6, all significantly different from 0 (least-squares linear regression, $p < 0.05$). The slopes and coefficients of determination (the R^2 – values) are further evaluated in Fig. 3 and Table 1. The slopes measured at 665 and 550 nm for nitrogen replete, limiting light conditions are 3.5 – 3.6 and significantly higher than the rest of the slopes (2.3 – 2.8) ($p < 0.001$), but not significantly different from each other ($p > 0.05$, Fig. 3 and Table 1). This indicates that under nitrogen replete limiting light conditions, the direct cell count is accompanied by a larger increase in OD when OD is measured within the absorption range of chlorophyll than is the case for the other treatments. Measurement at 665 and 550 nm tend to give a higher increase in OD per change in cell count than measurement at 750 nm, although this is only statistically significant under nitrogen replete conditions, independently of light level ($p < 0.001$, Table 1, Fig. 3), not at nitrogen deplete conditions ($p > 0.05$, Table 1, Fig. 3). The coefficients of determination are all high, > 0.95 (Table 1), but with a clear tendency for the nitrogen deplete saturating light treatment to give the highest determination coefficients, ≈ 0.98 . This treatment thus gives the strongest relationship between cell count and OD with some 98 % of the variation in OD being explained by increases in cell count (Table 1, Fig. 3).

Variation in carbon and nitrogen biomass and cell content

The carbon biomass of all treatments showed a direct linear relationship to the increasing cell counts (Table 1, Fig. 4). The slope of this relationship is significantly lower for algae grown

under nitrogen replete, but light limited conditions ($4.53 \times 10^{-5} \mu\text{g C cell}^{-1}$), than for the other three treatments that varied from $8.13 - 8.97 \times 10^{-5} \mu\text{g C cell}^{-1}$ with no statistically significant differences among them (Table 1, Fig. 4). The nitrogen biomass also showed initial linear increases with cell count in all four treatments (Table 1, Fig. 5). However, for the two nitrogen deplete treatments, the nitrogen biomass leveled off at cells counts of 2.58×10^6 under light limitation and 2.86×10^6 under light saturation (Fig. 5), and did not show any further increase despite continued increase in the cell counts. This is reflected in changes in the cell C/N-ratios and cell nitrogen content over time (Fig. 6), where the two nitrogen deplete treatments show a decline in C/N-ratio and cell nitrogen content over time, while the two nitrogen replete treatments do not show any statistically significant changes in these parameters over time. None of the four treatments shows any statistically significant changes in cell carbon content over time.

Pigment content

Chlorophyll concentrations are shown in Table 1 and Fig. 7. Concentrations of chlorophyll *a* are significantly higher under nitrogen replete limiting light conditions (4.3 pg cell^{-1}) than under the other treatments (ANOVA followed by Tukey post-hoc test, $p < 0.0001$). There is a tendency for chlorophyll *a* concentration to be higher under light limited conditions, although is only statistically significant for the nitrogen replete treatment. Concentrations of chlorophyll *c* were very low, but tended to follow the same overall pattern as for chlorophyll *a*.

Phycoerythrin concentrations are shown in Fig. 8. Concentrations varied from 0.72 to $7.35 \text{ pg cell}^{-1}$. Concentrations were higher under nitrogen replete conditions than under

nitrogen deplete conditions (ANOVA followed by Tukey post-hoc test, $p < 0.0001$), with a non-significantly tendency to be higher under limiting than under saturating light (Fig. 8).

Discussion

Not surprisingly, the growth rates of *Rhodomonas* in our study depend on both irradiance and nitrogen availability. The highest growth rate is thus achieved with saturating light and high nitrogen availability and is 0.82 d^{-1} , which is in good accordance with growth rates reported in the literature for *Rhodomonas* growing under optimal conditions (Guevara et al., 2016). The lowest growth rates, 0.21 d^{-1} , achieved under limiting light, are among the lowest reported in the literature, and confirms that this set of conditions is strongly limiting for *Rhodomonas* growth (Hammer et al., 2002). Comparison across treatments indicate that light is the more important factor controlling growth rate in present study, as the growth rate drops a factor of almost four when lowering the irradiance with the same nitrogen availability. In contrast lowering nitrogen availability under the same irradiance only lowers the growth rate from 0.82 d^{-1} to 0.50 d^{-1} under saturating light and not at all under light limitation.

Chlorophyll does not vary in parallel with growth rate, indicating that growth rate is not directly controlled by cell chlorophyll content. The highest cell chlorophyll concentrations are achieved under low irradiance and high nitrogen availability, as is usually found to be the case in algae and plants (e.g. Horton et al., 1996); while the lowest cell chlorophyll concentrations likewise are found under high irradiance. Phycoerythrin shows a similar pattern, with the highest concentrations under nitrogen replete conditions and with a non-significant tendency to be higher under light limitation. Similar results have been reported before (Vu et al., 2016), and are no doubt caused by the fact that phycoerythrin in

Rhodomonas is a light-harvesting billi-protein pigment with a similar role in cryptophyte photosynthesis as chlorophyll.

The OD – cell count relationships evince high R^2 - values and cell count always explain more than 95 % of the variation in OD regardless of treatment and wavelength, indicating that the contribution of changes in cellular properties to OD is always small. This means that no matter the physiological state of the microalgae and regardless of which wavelength used, within the absorption range of chlorophyll or not, it is possible to establish a good, strong relationship between OD and cell concentration. Hence, OD seems a very robust proxy for microalgal biomass in different physiological states. The regression slopes, however, clearly depend on the physiological state of the algae, as well as on the wavelength used. They are highest at low irradiance and high nitrogen availability, just like cell chlorophyll content, but are lowest under low irradiance and low nitrogen availability This most likely is due to the OD – cell count relationship being governed primarily by nitrogen availability and to a lesser extent by irradiance. The regression coefficients of the two saturating light treatments are intermediate. Interestingly, this pattern is seen for all three wavelengths, although it was expected that only OD measured at the two wavelengths within the absorption range of chlorophyll, 665 and 550 nm, would depend on cell chlorophyll content. It is possible that cell chlorophyll content co-vary with other parameters contributing to the absorption at 750 nm (Griffiths et al., 2011).

Higher cell chlorophyll contents not surprisingly cause a higher OD for any given cell concentration. This is obviously most pronounced at 665 and 550 nm where we find the highest slopes of the cell count – OD relationships. The differences in R^2 - values are always very small, ranging from 0.95 to 0.98.

All four treatments show strong, linear, relationships between cell counts and carbon biomass. Interestingly, the slope of the relationship for the nitrogen replete, light limited treatment is only approximately 50 % (4.53) of the slopes of the three other treatments (8.13 – 8.97). It is possible that this is caused by microalgal cells under light limited, but nitrogen replete, conditions investing more in nitrogen uptake and storage in e.g. amino acids and pigments than in increased carbon biomass. This hypothesis is in accordance with the observed patterns of chlorophyll and phycoerythrin contents in the cells. In accordance with the observed linear relationships between cell count and carbon biomass, the cell carbon content is constant in all four treatments. We also observe linear relationships between cell counts and nitrogen biomass, but for the two nitrogen limited treatments only up to a certain point, where nitrogen apparently becomes limiting, and the carbon biomass of the culture continues to increase, while the nitrogen biomass remains constant. This happens at approximately the same cell densities regardless of light conditions, at a cell count of about 2.6×10^5 cells ml⁻¹ under light limited conditions and 2.8×10^5 cells ml⁻¹ under light saturation. It is accompanied by a decrease in cellular nitrogen content and increasing C/N – ratios of the cells from both nitrogen limited treatments, while the cellular nitrogen content and C/N – ratios remain constant for cells under nitrogen replete conditions.

We established coefficients for the relationships between OD and both carbon biomass and nitrogen biomass. These were highest when OD was measured at 750 nm, but only slightly lower when measured at the two other wavelengths, 665 and 550 nm. Obviously, these coefficients are affected both by the established relationships between OD and cell count and between cell count and carbon and nitrogen biomass, respectively.

We can conclude that it is indeed possible to use the convenient, fast and reliable OD measurement as a proxy for microalgal biomass during microalgal biomass production. The

three different wavelengths used in our study can all be used for measurements of OD, although the two wavelengths that lie within the absorption range of chlorophyll give stronger OD signals for any increase in microalgal biomass, especially under nitrogen replete conditions, which may be advantageous in some situations. The R^2 – values are always high, evincing very small differences, indicating that the ‘noise’ caused by cell pigment content is minimal. It is, however, important to take into account that the precise relationship between OD and biomass, here measured as cell count, does depend on factors such as irradiance and nutrient availability. These factors determine the physiological state of the algae, which translates into their overall absorbance signal, which must therefore be established in each specific case and set of production parameters. Especially if the microalgae become nitrogen limited during growth the OD measurements need to be interpreted carefully as cell division will cease under these conditions, while an increase in carbon biomass can still be observed. Failing to consider these factors, may cause over- or under-estimation of the biomass present, which can have serious economic consequences further downstream in the production. Based on differences among slopes, errors in biomass estimation may vary from 44 % based on cell concentration, over 66 % for carbon biomass, to 95 % for nitrogen biomass.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a grant from Innovation Fund Denmark [COpepod egg Mass production in Aquaculture (COMA), grant no. 67-2013-1].

We wish to thank our students who contributed to the laboratory work: Solène Foe Ayida, Léo Langot, Daniel Ellehammer Larsen, Tafadzwa Lucky Maphosa and Gemma Gassol.

372 **Data availability statement**

373 All data in presented in this paper are original for this study. The data that support the
374 findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

375

References

- Antoine SE, Benson-Evans K (1983) The effect of light intensity and quality on the growth of benthic algae. I: Phytopigment variations. *Archiv für Hydrobiologie*, **98**, 299-306.
- Becker EW (1994) *Microalgae - Biotechnology and Microbiology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bennett A, Bogorad L (1973) Complementary chromatic adaptation in a filamentous blue-green alga. *Journal of Cell Biology*, **58**, 419-435.
- Griffiths MJ, Garcin C, van Hille RP, Harrison STL (2011) Interference by pigment in the estimation of microalgal biomass concentration by optical density. *Journal of Microbiological Methods*, **85**, 119-123.
- Guedes AC, Amaro HM, Malcata FX (2011) Microalgae As Sources of High Added-Value Compounds-A Brief Review of Recent Work. *Biotechnology Progress*, **27**, 597-613.
- Guevara M, Arredondo-Vega BO, Palacios Y, Saez K, Gomez PI (2016) Comparison of growth and biochemical parameters of two strains of *Rhodomonas salina* (Cryptophyceae) cultivated under different combinations of irradiance, temperature, and nutrients. *Journal of Applied Phycology*, **28**, 2651-2660.
- Hammer A, Schumann R, Schubert H (2002) Light and temperature acclimation of *Rhodomonas salina* (Cryptophyceae): photosynthetic performance. *Aquatic Microbial Ecology*, **29**, 287-296.
- Hansen PJ (1989) The red tide dinoflagellate *Alexandrium tamarense* – effects on behaviour and growth of a tintinnid ciliate. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **53**, 105-116.
- Horton P, Ruban AV, Walters RG (1996) Regulation of light harvesting in green plants. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology*, **47**, 655-684.
- Jeffrey SW, Humphrey GF (1975) New spectrophotometric equations for determining chlorophylls *a*, *b*, *c1* and *c2* in higher plants, algae and natural phytoplankton. *Biochemie Und Physiologie Der Pflanzen*, **167**, 191-194.
- Kirk JTO (1994) *Light and photosynthesis in aquatic ecosystems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Quinn GP, Keough MJ (2002) *Experimental design and data analysis for biologists*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ritchie RJ (2006) Consistent sets of spectrophotometric chlorophyll equations for acetone, methanol and ethanol solvents. *Photosynthesis Research*, **89**, 27-41.
- Sarrafzadeh MH, La HJ, Seo SH, Asgharnejad H, Oh HM (2015) Evaluation of various techniques for microalgal biomass quantification. *Journal of Biotechnology*, **216**, 90-97.
- Sasso S, Pohnert G, Lohr M, Mittag M, Hertweck C (2012) Microalgae in the postgenomic era: a blooming reservoir for new natural products. *Fems Microbiology Reviews*, **36**, 761-785.
- Seip KL, Sas H, Vermij S (1992) Nutrient-chlorophyll trajectories across trophic gradients. *Aquatic Science*, **54**, 58-76.
- Shuler ML, Kargi F (2005) *Bioprocess engineering: Basic concepts*, Pearson Education, Singapore.
- Skarka J (2012) Microalgae biomass potential in Europe. *Technikfolgenabschätzung - Theorie und Praxis*, **21**, 72-79.
- Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ (1995) *Biometry*, W.H. Freeman and Company, New York.
- Thoisen C, Hansen BW, Nielsen SL (2017) A simple and fast method for extraction and quantification of cryptophyte phycoerythrin. *MethodsX*, **4**, 209-213.

423 Vu MTT, Douette C, Rayner TA, Thoisen C, Nielsen SL, Hansen BW (2016) Optimization
424 of photosynthesis, growth, and biochemical composition of the microalga
425 Rhodomonas salina-an established diet for live feed copepods in aquaculture. *Journal*
426 *of Applied Phycology*, **28**, 1485-1500.
427 Zimba PV (2012) An improved phycobilin extraction method. *Harmful Algae*, **17**, 35-39.

428

429

Table 1

Data for growth rates (μ) of the microalga *Rhodomonas salina*, slopes and squared multiple correlation coefficients of cell count – optical density relationships; as well as slopes of cell count – carbon biomass and cell count – nitrogen biomass for the algae growth under the four different treatment conditions in this experiment. Results are expressed as means \pm 1 SD.

Treatment	Growth rate, μ (d ⁻¹)	Slope of cell count – OD relationship (x 10 ⁻⁵)			R ²			Slope of cell count – carbon biomass relationship (x 10 ⁻⁵)	Slope of cell count – nitrogen biomass relationship (x 10 ⁻⁵)
		750 nm	665 nm	550 nm	750 nm	665 nm	550 nm		
Nitrogen replete, Limiting light	0.21 ± 0.01	2.79 ± 0.12	3.47 ± 0.14	3.62 ± 0.14	0.952	0.956	0.958	4.53 ± 0.36	0.91 ± 0.07
Nitrogen replete, Saturating light	0.82 ± 0.03	2.47 ± 0.09	2.72 ± 0.09	2.72 ± 0.084	0.964	0.966	0.971	8.13 ± 0.60	0.80 ± 0.24
Nitrogen deplete, Limiting light	0.21 ± 0.03	2.32 ± 0.15	2.62 ± 0.16	2.67 ± 0.14	0.958	0.965	0.974	8.97 ± 0.72	1.22 ± 0.62
Nitrogen deplete, Saturating light	0.50 ± 0.07	2.57 ± 0.12	2.71 ± 0.13	2.70 ± 0.13	0.979	0.978	0.978	8.27 ± 0.99	0.43 ± 0.07

Table 2

Calculated coefficients for the relationships between optical density and carbon and nitrogen biomass, respectively. Carbon biomass is expressed as $\mu\text{g C ml}^{-1}$ and nitrogen biomass as $\mu\text{g N ml}^{-1}$. For the two nitrogen deplete treatments, coefficients for nitrogen-limited growth (Fig. 5) are given in brackets.

Treatment	Carbon biomass - OD			Nitrogen Biomass - OD		
	750 nm	665 nm	550 nm	750 nm	665 nm	550 nm
Nitrogen replete, Limiting light	1.62	1.31	1.25	0.33	0.26	0.25
Nitrogen replete, Saturating light	3.29	2.99	2.99	0.32	0.29	0.29
Nitrogen deplete, Limiting light	3.87	3.42	3.36	0.53 (-0.002)	0.47 (-0.002)	0.45 (-0.002)
Nitrogen deplete, Saturating light	3.22	3.05	3.06	0.17 (-0.004)	0.16 (-0.003)	0.16 (-0.003)

Figure legends

Figure 1

Growth in cell counts over time in the four treatments. A: Nitrogen replete, limiting light; B: Nitrogen replete, saturating light; C: Nitrogen deplete, limiting light; D: Nitrogen deplete, saturating light. The lines represent the fitted regression lines. For treatments A and B, simple least-squares regression lines are given. For treatment C and D, the lines represent sequential least-squares regression lines. Please note that X-axes have different scales for nitrogen replete vs. deplete treatments and that the Y-axes are logarithmic.

Figure 2

Relationship between cell count and optical density (OD), measured at three different wavelengths, 750, 665 and 550 nm. The lines represent the fitted least-squares regression lines. Panel A: Nitrogen replete, limiting light treatment. Panel B: Nitrogen replete, saturating light treatment. Panel C: Nitrogen deplete, limiting light treatment. Panel D: Nitrogen deplete, saturating light treatment.

Figure 3

Comparisons of slopes for the regression lines from the cell count – optical density relationships for the four treatments, measured at the three wavelengths, 750, 665 and 550 nm. A: Nitrogen replete, limiting light; B: Nitrogen replete, saturating light; C: Nitrogen deplete, limiting light; D: Nitrogen deplete, saturating light. Error bars represent 95 % C.I., allowing direct visual comparisons.

Figure 4

Increase in carbon biomass as a function of increasing cell count per ml. The lines represent the fitted least-squares regression lines. Panel A: Nitrogen replete, limiting light treatment. Panel B: Nitrogen replete, saturating light treatment. Panel C: Nitrogen deplete, limiting light treatment. Panel D: Nitrogen deplete, saturating light treatment.

Figure 5

Increase in nitrogen biomass as a function of increasing cell count per ml. Panel A: Nitrogen replete, limiting light treatment. Panel B: Nitrogen replete, saturating light treatment. Panel C: Nitrogen deplete, limiting light treatment. Panel D: Nitrogen deplete, saturating light treatment. The lines represent the fitted regression lines. For treatments A and B, simple least-squares regression lines are given. For treatment C and D, the lines represent sequential least-squares regression lines.

Figure 6

Variation in C/N-ratio (upper panel), cell carbon content (middle panel) and cell nitrogen content (lower panel). Circles: nitrogen replete treatments, squares: nitrogen deplete treatments, filled data points: limiting light, open data points: saturating light. Least-squares linear regression lines were fitted if the variation of the parameter over time was found to be statistically significant.

Figure 7

Chlorophyll concentrations (pg cell^{-1}) of algae from the four treatments. Values are given as means with error bars indicating 1 SD. Different letters indicate statistically significant

differences between treatments. Black bars and capital letters: Chl *a*, grey bars and lower case letters: Chl *c*, open bars indicate the sum of Chl *a* and *c* concentrations. A: Nitrogen replete, limiting light; B: Nitrogen replete, saturating light; C: Nitrogen deplete, limiting light; D: Nitrogen deplete, saturating light.

Figure 8

Phycoerythrin concentrations (pg cell⁻¹) of algae from the four treatments. Values are given as means with error bars indicating 1 SD. Different letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments. A: Nitrogen replete, limiting light; B: Nitrogen replete, saturating light; C: Nitrogen deplete, limiting light; D: Nitrogen deplete, saturating light.













